

Remarks

No amendments are tendered. Claims 1-8, 10-12, and 14-16 are subject to restriction between three groups. While Applicants are concerned that the Examiner has made little or no showing to meet his burden of proof¹, nonetheless, Applicants elect Group 2, claims 1-8 and 14-15, without traverse.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian J. Hubbard/

November 29, 2007

Brian J. Hubbard
Registration No. 45,873
Phone: 989-636-6007

P. O. Box 1967
Midland, MI 48641-1967
BJH/mlv

¹ Section 1893.03(d) of the MPEP states:

When making a lack of unity of invention requirement, the examiner **must** (1) list the different groups of claims and (2) **explain** why each group lacks unity with each other group (i.e., why there is no single general inventive concept) *specifically describing the unique special technical feature in each group*.

(Emphasis added). The Examiner failed to refer to any claims except 1 and 7 (from Group 2), thus impermissibly ignoring any analysis of Groups 1 and 3.